1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT SEATTLE 9 ANDREW MARK SALAZAR, CASE NO. C17-1770JLR 10 ORDER CONSTRUING Petitioner, 11 PLEADING AS A MOTION TO v. RECUSE, DENYING THE 12 MOTION, AND REFERRING UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE MOTION TO THE CHIEF 13 JUDGE Respondent. 14 15 I. **INTRODUCTION** 16 17

Before the court is pro se Petitioner Andrew Mark Salazar's motion to set aside, vacate, or correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. (Mot. (Dkt. # 1).) In the course of his motion, Petitioner states that he "questions whether [his] excessive sentence was the intent of Congress and whether the trial judge is impartial and unbias [sic], when rendering a decision so obviously favorable to the Government." (*Id.* at 4.) The court liberally construes this statement as a motion to recuse. The court has considered the

18

19

20

21

22

1 motion to recuse and denies it for the reasons set forth below. The court further directs
2 the Clerk to refer the motion to Chief Judge Ricardo S. Martinez for further review.

II. BACKGROUND & ANALYSIS

On April 13, 2015, Petitioner entered into a plea agreement in which he pleaded guilty to (1) possession of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252(a)(4)(B) and 2252(b)(2), and (2) receipt of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252(a)(2) and (b)(1). (*See United States v. Salazar*, No. CR14-0275JLR (W.D. Wash.), Plea Agreement (Dkt. # 45) ¶¶ 1.a, 1.b.) On August 3, 2015, the court sentenced

Petitioner to 238 months of incarceration on both counts to run concurrently. (*Id.*, Min.

Entry (Dkt. # 58); Judgment (Dkt. # 59).) On November 11, 2017, Petitioner filed his present motion to set aside, vacate, or correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§ 2255—a portion of which the court liberally construes as a motion to recuse. (See Mot.

14 || at 4.)

Under the Local Civil Rules for the Western District of Washington, "[w]henever a motion to recuse directed at a judge of this court is filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144 or 28 U.S.C. § 455, the challenged judge will review the motion papers and decide whether to recuse voluntarily." Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 3(f). "If the challenged judge decides not to voluntarily recuse, he or she will direct the clerk to refer the motion to the chief judge, or the chief judge's designee." *Id*.

"The substantive standard for recusal under 28 U.S.C. § 144 and 28 U.S.C. § 455 is the same: Whether a reasonable person with knowledge of all the facts would

1 conclude that the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned." *United States v.* 2 McTiernan, 695 F.3d 882, 891 (9th Cir. 2012) (internal quotation marks omitted). Other 3 than stating that he "questions" whether the judge is "impartial and unbias[ed]," 4 Petitioner identifies no basis for recusal. (See Mot. at 4.) Specifically, he does not allege 5 facts to support the contention that the undersigned judge is presiding over a case in 6 which his "impartiality might reasonably be questioned," *McTiernan*, 695 F.3d at 891; 7 see also 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), "has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or 8 personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding," id. 9 § 455(b)(1); see also id. § 144, served as a lawyer in this controversy while in private 10 practice, id. § 455(b)(2), or has a financial interest in this litigation, id. § 455(b)(3)-(4). 11 In addition, the court cannot independently conceive of a basis for recusal. For these reasons, the court denies Petitioner's recusal motion and directs the Clerk to refer this 12 13 order and Petitioner's motion to Chief Judge Ricardo S. Martinez. 14 III. **CONCLUSION** 15 For the reasons set forth above, the court DENIES Petitioner's motion to recuse, 16 which is contained on page 4 of his motion to set aside, vacate, or correct his sentence 17 // 18 19 20 21

22

pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Dkt. #1) and DIRECTS the Clerk to refer this order and the motion to Chief Judge Ricardo S. Martinez for further review. Dated this 18th day of December, 2017. R. Plut JAMES L. ROBART United States District Judge